arXiv:1109.4211v2 [math.DG] 16 Oct 2011

Isometric embedding of negatively curved complete surfaces in Lorentz-Minkowski space

Bing-Long Chen and Le Yin

October 16, 2011

Abstract

Hilbert-Efimov theorem states that any complete surface with curvature bounded above by a negative constant can not be isometrically imbedded in $\mathbb{R}^3$. We demonstrate that any simply-connected smooth complete surface with curvature bounded above by a negative constant admits a smooth isometric embedding into the Lorentz-Minkowski space $\mathbb{R}^{2,1}$.

1 Introduction

Many closed convex surfaces can be easily found in $\mathbb{R}^3$. In 1906, Weyl[20] posed the problem whether an abstract compact smooth simply-connected two dimensional Riemannian manifold with positive curvature could be realized in $\mathbb{R}^3$. The problem, named after Weyl, was investigated by Weyl-Lewy-Alexandrov, and finally resolved (in smooth category) by Nirenberg [17] and Pogorelov [18] independently.

The generalization to nonnegative curvature case was done by Guan-Li [7] and Hong-Zuilly [14], and only $C^{1,1}$ imbedding was obtained. For local isometric embeddings, there were important breakthroughs of Lin [15] [16], Han-Hong-Lin [12], Han [9] [10]. The reader is refereed to the survey articles Hong [13], Yau [21] and the book Han-Hong [11].

The story is completely different for surfaces with negative curvature, the famous Hilbert-Efimov theorem([8],[2]) asserts that any complete surface with curvature bounded above by a negative constant can not be realized in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

On the other hand, the hyperbolic plane $\mathbb{H}^2$ admits a canonical smooth isometric embedding in the 3-dimensional Lorentz-Minkowski space $\mathbb{R}^{2,1}$ as a unit imaginary sphere $x_3^2-(x_1^2+x_2^2)=1$. Here $\mathbb{R}^{2,1}$ is $\mathbb{R}^3$ equipped with metric $ds^2=dx_1^2+dx_2^2-dx_3^2$. Instead of the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^3$, it is proved that the Lorentz-Minkowski space $\mathbb{R}^{2,1}$ is the appropriate ambient space for the isometric imbedding of strongly negatively curved surfaces.

The problem of isometric embedding of surfaces with boundary into $\mathbb{R}^{2,1}$ actually has been studied by B. Guan [4]. The author proved that the smooth metric of negative curvature on 2-disc $\mathcal{D}$ with boundary $\partial\mathcal{D}$ of positive geodesic curvature

---

The first author was supported partially by grants NSFC11025107, NSFC10831008, FRFCU2010-34000-3162643, HLTP34000-5221001, and the second author(corresponding author) by NSFC 11101289.

admits a smooth isometric embedding $X : \mathcal{D} \to \mathbb{R}^{2,1}$ with planar boundary $X(\partial\mathcal{D}) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. The purpose of the paper is to find global isometric embeddings for complete surfaces. The main result is the following:

Theorem 1.1 *Let (M, g) be a smooth two-dimensional simply-connected complete Riemannian manifold with curvature K satisfying*

$$K \leq -C_1 \tag{1.1}$$

for some positive constant $C_1 > 0$. Then there exists a smooth isometric embedding $X : M \to \mathbb{R}^{2,1}$, and the spacelike submanifold $X(M)$ is a graph over $\mathbb{R}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^{2,1}$: $(x_1, x_2, 0) \to (x_1, x_2, Z(x_1, x_2))$ satisfying

$$\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2} \leq Z(x_1, x_2) \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{C_1} + x_1^2 + x_2^2}. \tag{1.2}$$

Remark 1.1 *It is likely that the solution of the isometric embedding problem is far from being unique if we drop the restriction (1.2)(or (1.8) below). Actually, a remarkable fact (see [5]) is that there are many distinct isometric embeddings for the hyperbolic plane $\mathbb{H}^2$ into $\mathbb{R}^{2,1}$, some of them even have unbounded second fundamental forms and violate (1.2)(or (1.8)). In this sense, the isometric embedding provided by Theorem 1.1 or the following Theorem 1.2 is rather special. The construction and classification of all other exotic embeddings deserve a further study.*

The following Theorem 1.2 refines the previous one, it handles the estimate of extrinsic geometries of the embedding. The estimate is not trivial, it holds for the particular embedding constructed in the theorem. Note that by Remark 1.1, it is possible that some exotic embeddings may violate the estimate. Theorem 1.3 asserts the uniqueness of these particular embeddings. We remark that the boundedness of the second fundamental form is not sufficient to guarantee the uniqueness of the isometric embedding.

Theorem 1.2 *Let (M, g) be a smooth two-dimensional simply-connected complete Riemannian manifold, whose Gauss curvature satisfies*

$$-C_2 \leq K \leq -C_1, \tag{1.3}$$

$$\sup_{d(x,y)\leq 1} \frac{|K(x) - K(y)|}{d(x,y)^\mu} \leq C_\mu, \tag{1.4}$$

for some positive constants $C_2 \geq C_1 > 0$, $1 > \mu > 0$, $C_\mu > 0$.

Then there exists a smooth isometric embedding $X : M \to \mathbb{R}^{2,1}$ such that the spacelike submanifold $X(M)$ is a graph over $\mathbb{R}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^{2,1}$: $(x_1, x_2, 0) \to (x_1, x_2, Z(x_1, x_2))$ satisfying

i)

$$\sqrt{\frac{1}{C_2} + x_1^2 + x_2^2} \leq Z(x_1, x_2) \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{C_1} + x_1^2 + x_2^2}; \tag{1.5}$$

ii) $|A| \leq C$, where A is the second fundamental form of the submanifold $X(M)$, constant C only depends on C_1, C_2 and C_μ.

Remark 1.2 *If the curvature covariant derivatives up to order l are assumed to be bounded in Theorem 1.2, i.e.*

$$\sum_{p=0}^{l} |\nabla^p K| \leq \bar{C}_l \tag{1.6}$$

for some $l \geq 1$, then the covariant derivatives of the second fundamental form of $X(M)$ up to order $l-1$ are also bounded

$$\sup_{x \in X(M)} \sum_{p=0}^{l-1} |\nabla^p A|(x) \leq C \tag{1.7}$$

for some C depending only on $\bar{C}_l$.

Theorem 1.3 *Under assumptions of Theorem 1.2, let X be the isometric imbedding constructed in Theorem 1.2. Then*

i) let $\tilde{X}$ be another isometric embedding of (M, g) into $\mathbb{R}^{2,1}$ such that $\tilde{X}(M)$ is represented as an graph

$$\sqrt{y_1^2 + y_2^2} \leq \tilde{Z}(y_1, y_2) \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{C} + y_1^2 + y_2^2}, \tag{1.8}$$

in some Lorentz-Minkowski coordinate system $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$, then there is an isometry $\iota \in Iso(\mathbb{R}^{2,1})$ such that $\tilde{X} = \iota \circ X$;

ii) there is an injective homomorphism $\rho : Iso(M, g) \to Iso(\mathbb{H}) \subset Iso(\mathbb{R}^{2,1})$ such that

$$X \circ \gamma = \rho(\gamma) \circ X$$

for any $\gamma \in Iso(M, g)$, where $Iso(M, g)$, $Iso(\mathbb{H})$, $Iso(\mathbb{R}^{2,1})$ are the groups of isometries of M, the unit imaginary sphere in $\mathbb{R}^{2,1}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{2,1}$ respectively.

We discuss the proof of the Theorems. It is reduced to solving certain equation of Monge-Ampère type:

$$\frac{\det(\nabla^2 u + g)}{\det(g)} = -K_g(|\nabla u|^2 + 2u) \tag{1.9}$$

on the whole manifold M. The corresponding Dirichlet problems may be solved on a sequence of exhausting domains Ω_l with some particular boundary values. The problem amounts to derive certain uniform a priori estimates for these solutions u_l. The bulk of the present paper is devoted to these estimates. Historically, there were two sorts of methods to derive the second order derivative estimate (for Weyl problem or Minkowski problem). The first one was developed by Weyl, Nirenberg, Pogorelov, Cheng-Yau etc., the second one was done by Lewy and Heinz. The former is straightforward and works for higher dimensions, but the argument is hardly to be localized. The latter one is complex in nature, but the estimate is purely local estimate, although it is hardly to be generalized to higher dimensions.

The structure of the paper is the following. In section 2, we outline a sketch of the proof and derive the zero and first order estimates. In section 3, we derive the second and higher order estimates, and Theorem 1.1 is proved in this section. The proof of Theorems 1.2, 1.3 will be given in section 4. In the appendix, we supply an alternative, straightforward argument for the second order derivative estimate.

2 Zero and first order estimates

2.1 Sketch of proof

Suppose $X : M \to \mathbb{R}^{2,1}$ is an isometric embedding, then $X(M)$ is a spacelike submanifold and the Gauss-Codazzi-Weingarten equations read as follows

$$\begin{aligned}&\nabla_i\nabla_j X = h_{ij}\vec{n},\\&\nabla_i\vec{n} = h_{ij}g^{jk}X_k,\\&R_{ijkl} = -(h_{ik}h_{jl} - h_{il}h_{jk}),\\&\nabla_i h_{jk} = \nabla_j h_{ik},\end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where $\vec{n}$, h_{ij}, R_{ijkl} are the normal vector, second fundamental form and the curvature tensor respectively.

Let $u = -\frac{1}{2}\langle X, X\rangle$, where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is the Lorentz-Minkowski metric. By (2.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\nabla_i u = -\langle X, X_i\rangle,\\&\nabla_i\nabla_j u = -h_{ij}\langle\vec{n}, X\rangle - g_{ij}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}\langle X, X\rangle =&\sum_{i=1}^{2} g^{ij}\langle X, X_i\rangle\langle X, X_j\rangle - \langle X, \vec{n}\rangle^2\\=&|\nabla u|^2 - \langle X, \vec{n}\rangle^2,\end{aligned}$$

then

$$\langle X, \vec{n}\rangle^2 = |\nabla u|^2 + 2u. \tag{2.3}$$

Combining (2.1) (2.2) and (2.3), we get

$$\frac{\det(\nabla^2 u + g)}{\det(g)} = -K_g(|\nabla u|^2 + 2u). \tag{2.4}$$

Note that equation (2.4) satisfied by the function $-\frac{1}{2}\langle X, X\rangle$ is an intrinsic one defined on (M, g).

Conversely, if we can solve equation (2.4), and get a bounded positive solution u of (2.4) on M, we will show in the following that this yields an isometric embedding $X : (M, g) \to \mathbb{R}^{2,1}$ such that $-\frac{1}{2}\langle X, X\rangle = u$.

To construct this isometric embedding, we need to introduce the polar coordinates in the open future timelike cone $\mathcal{I}^+ = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^{2,1} | \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2} < x_3\}$. In this polar coordinate system, the Lorentz-Minkowski metric takes the form

$$-dr^2 + r^2 ds_{\mathbb{H}}^2, \tag{2.5}$$

where $r = \sqrt{x_3^2 - x_1^2 - x_2^2}$ and $ds_{\mathbb{H}}^2$ is the hyperbolic metric($K = -1$) of the unit imaginary sphere: $r = 1$.

Proposition 2.1 *For a positive C^2 function u on M, define a new metric*

$$\bar{g} = \frac{g + (d\sqrt{2u})^2}{2u}$$

on M. The Gauss curvature $K_{\bar g}$ of $\bar g$ is given by

$$K_{\bar{g}} = -1 + \frac{\frac{\det(\nabla^2 u + g)}{\det(g)} + K_g(|\nabla u|^2 + 2u)}{(1 + \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2u})^2}. \tag{2.6}$$

Proof. The Gauss curvature of the metric $g_1 \triangleq g + (d\sqrt{2u})^2$ can be computed by the formula (see [4], [13])

$$K_{g_1} = \frac{1}{1 + |\nabla\sqrt{2u}|^2}(K_g + \frac{\det(\nabla^2\sqrt{2u})}{\det(g)(1 + |\nabla\sqrt{2u}|^2)}).$$

From the curvature formula of conformal transformation $\bar g = \frac{g_1}{2u}$, a straightforward computation shows

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{K_{\bar g}}{2u} =& K_{g_1} + \frac{1}{2}\triangle_{g_1}\log u \\ =& -\frac{1}{2u} + \frac{1}{2u}\frac{\frac{\det(\nabla^2 u + g)}{\det(g)} + K_g(|\nabla u|^2 + 2u)}{(1 + \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2u})^2}.\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 2.1 *If we can solve (2.4), and u is a bounded positive smooth solution, then the metric $\bar g$ in Proposition 2.1 is complete and has constant curvature -1. Hence there exists an isometry $i : (M, \bar g) \to \mathbb{H} = \{r = 1\}$ and we can construct an embedding $I : (M, g) \to \mathcal{I}^+ \subset \mathbb{R}^{2,1}$ as $I(y) \triangleq (i(y), \sqrt{2u(y)})$ in the polar coordinate system (2.5). It is clear that*

$$\begin{aligned}I^*(-dr^2 + r^2 ds^2_{\mathbb{H}}) =& -(d\sqrt{2u})^2 + 2u i^*(ds^2_{\mathbb{H}}) \\ =& -(d\sqrt{2u})^2 + 2u\bar g \\ =& g,\end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

which shows that the map I is the desired isometric embedding. The regularity of the embedding I follows from the regularity of u.

Hence the proof of Theorem 1.1 may be reduced to solving equation (2.4). The result to be proved is the following:

Theorem 2.2 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, equation (2.4) has a smooth bounded positive solution u such that $0 < u \leq \frac{1}{2C_1}$.*

The following strategy will be adapted to solve equation (2.4). We first solve the equation (2.4) on a sequence of compact smooth exhausting domains $\Omega_1 \subset\subset \Omega_2 \subset\subset \cdots$. Let u_l be the solution on Ω_l. Fix $x_0 \in M$, we will show that for any nonnegative integer $k \geq 0$, there exists a constant $D_k > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\Omega_l \supset B(x_0, k+1)} |u_l|_{C^k(\bar B(x_0, k))} \leq D_k, \tag{2.8}$$

where the norm $C^k(\bar{B}(x_0, k))$ can be defined on some (and any) fixed finite coordinate covering of $\bar{B}(x_0, k)$. Once (2.8) has been obtained, we can extract a subsequence of u_l by Arzela-Ascoli theorem such that the limit is a smooth solution of equation (2.4).

Indeed, we choose simply $\Omega_l = B(x_0, l)$ and consider the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\det(\nabla^2 u + g)}{\det(g)} = -K_g(|\nabla u|^2 + 2u). \\ u \mid_{\partial B(x_0,l)} = \dfrac{1}{2C_2(l)}, \end{cases} \tag{2.9}$$

where $C_2(l) = \max\limits_{x \in \bar{B}(x_0,l)} (-K_g(x))$.

Clearly, (2.9) has a subsolution $u_0 \equiv \frac{1}{2C_2(l)}$, i.e.

$$\frac{\det(\nabla^2 u_0 + g)}{\det(g)} \geq -K_g(|\nabla u_0|^2 + 2u_0).$$

By continuity method, this implies that (see [3]) (2.9) admits a smooth solution u_l which satisfies $u_l \geq u_0$ and $\nabla^2 u_l + g > 0$.

The main task of the subsequent sections is to derive a priori estimates for the solutions u_l so that (2.8) holds. For convenience, we drop the subscript l from u_l and Ω_l in the process of computations.

2.2 Zero and first order estimates

Proposition 2.3 *The solution u of the Dirichlet problem (2.9) satisfies*

$$\frac{1}{2C_2(l)} \leq u \leq \frac{1}{2C_1}. \tag{2.10}$$

Proof. By applying maximum principle to u, we have

$$\frac{1}{2C_2(l)} \leq u \leq \max\{\sup_{\Omega}(-\frac{1}{2K_g}), \frac{1}{2C_2(l)}\} \leq \frac{1}{2C_1}.$$

□

Proposition 2.4 *(1st-Order Estimate) The gradient of the solution u of (2.9) satisfies*

$$|\nabla u| \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{C_1}}. \tag{2.11}$$

Proof. We choose $\xi = \frac{1}{2C_2(l)} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{C_1}}(l - d(x_0, \cdot))$ as a barrier function. Clearly ξ satisfies $\xi \mid_{\partial\Omega} = \frac{1}{2C_2(l)}$ and $|\nabla \xi| \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{C_1}}$. By Hessian comparison theorem, we have

$$\triangle \xi = -\frac{2}{\sqrt{C_1}} \triangle d \leq -2.$$

On the other hand, from $\nabla^2 u + g > 0$, we know that

$$\triangle u + 2 > 0.$$

Hence $\triangle(u-\xi)>0$ on Ω. The maximum principle implies that $u\le\xi$. Therefore we have

$$|\nabla u|\,|_{\partial\Omega}\le|\nabla\xi|\le\frac{2}{\sqrt{C_1}}. \tag{2.12}$$

Now we consider the quantity $|\nabla u|^2+2u$. The maximum $\max_{\bar\Omega}(|\nabla u|^2+2u)$ is achieved either on the boundary or in the interior of the domain. In the former case, the maximum is bounded by $\frac{4}{C_1}+\frac{1}{C_2(l)}$ by (2.12). In the latter case, suppose the maximum is achieved at some point $\bar x\in\Omega$. Since

$$0=\nabla_i(|\nabla u|^2+2u)(\bar x)=2(u_{ij}+g_{ij})u_j(\bar x)$$

and $u_{ij}+g_{ij}>0$, it follows that $|\nabla u|(\bar x)=0$, and therefore

$$\max_{\bar\Omega}(|\nabla u|^2+2u)\le\max_{\bar\Omega}2u\le\frac{1}{C_1}.$$

Combining both cases, we get

$$\sup_{\bar\Omega}|\nabla u|\le\max\{\frac{2}{\sqrt{C_1}},\sqrt{\frac{1}{C_1}-\frac{1}{C_2(l)}}\}=\frac{2}{\sqrt{C_1}}.$$

□

Propositions 2.3 and 2.4 state that the function u and its gradient can be bounded from above by a constant independent of the domain Ω_l. Before estimating the lower bound of u, we need to construct cutoff functions around points where the values of u are not too large.

Lemma 2.5 *Fix $\tilde x\in M$, suppose there exist a real number $r_0>0$ and a solution u of (2.9) defined on domain $\Omega_l\supset B(\tilde x,r_0)$ satisfying*

$$u(\tilde x)<\frac{r_0}{2\sqrt{\max\limits_{y\in\bar B(\tilde x,r_0)}(-K_g(y))}\coth(\sqrt{\max\limits_{y\in\bar B(\tilde x,r_0)}(-K_g(y))}r_0)}. \tag{2.13}$$

Then there are a domain $Q_{\tilde x}\subset B(\tilde x,r_0)$ containing $\tilde x$ and a function $\varphi^{\tilde x}\in C^2(\bar Q_{\tilde x})$ such that

i) $0\le\varphi^{\tilde x}\le\dfrac{r_0}{2\sqrt{c_2}\coth(\sqrt{c_2}r_0)}$,

$\varphi^{\tilde x}\ge\dfrac{\frac{r_0}{2\sqrt{c_2}\coth(\sqrt{c_2}r_0)}-u(\tilde x)}{2}$ *on* $B(\tilde x,\dfrac{\sqrt{C_1}(\frac{r_0}{2\sqrt{c_2}\coth(\sqrt{c_2}r_0)}-u(\tilde x))}{6})$,

$\varphi^{\tilde x}\,|_{\partial Q_{\tilde x}}=0$,

ii) $|\nabla\varphi^{\tilde x}|\le\frac{3}{\sqrt{C_1}}$,

iii) $\nabla^2\varphi^{\tilde x}\ge-(\nabla^2u+g)$,

where $c_2=\max\limits_{y\in\bar B(\tilde x,r_0)}(-K_g(y))$.

Proof. Set

$$\xi = u + \frac{d^2(\tilde{x},\cdot)}{2\sqrt{c_2}r_0\coth(\sqrt{c_2}r_0)}, \quad Q_{\tilde{x}} = \{\xi < \frac{r_0}{2\sqrt{c_2}\coth(\sqrt{c_2}r_0)}\},$$

and

$$\varphi^{\tilde{x}} = \frac{r_0}{2\sqrt{c_2}\coth(\sqrt{c_2}r_0)} - \xi.$$

Then $\varphi^{\tilde{x}}$ satisfies i) and ii). To check that $\varphi^{\tilde{x}}$ satisfies iii), we use the Hessian comparison theorem

$$\nabla^2 d^2(\tilde{x},\cdot) \leq 2\sqrt{c_2}d(\tilde{x},\cdot)\coth(\sqrt{c_2}d(\tilde{x},\cdot))g$$

to conclude that

$$\nabla^2\xi \leq \nabla^2 u + g.$$

The proof of Lemma 2.5 is completed. ☐

Proposition 2.6 *(Lower bound of u) For any $\tilde{x} \in M$, $r_0 > 0$, assume the solution u of (2.9) is defined on a domain $\Omega \supset B(\tilde{x}, r_0)$, then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} u(\tilde{x}) \geq \min\{ & \frac{r_0}{4\sqrt{\max\limits_{\bar{B}(\tilde{x},r_0)}(-K_g(x))}\coth(\sqrt{\max\limits_{\bar{B}(\tilde{x},r_0)}(-K_g(x))}r_0)}, \\ & \frac{C_1 r_0^2}{36\max\limits_{\bar{B}(\tilde{x},r_0)}(-K_g(x))\coth^2(\sqrt{\max\limits_{\bar{B}(\tilde{x},r_0)}(-K_g(x))}r_0)}, \\ & \frac{1}{32\max\limits_{\bar{B}(\tilde{x},r_0)}(-K_g(x))}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

Proof. Assume

$$u(\tilde{x}) < \frac{r_0}{4\sqrt{\max\limits_{\bar{B}(\tilde{x},r_0)}(-K_g(x))}\coth(\sqrt{\max\limits_{\bar{B}(\tilde{x},r_0)}(-K_g(x))}r_0)}. \tag{2.15}$$

Clearly the condition (2.13) holds for this r_0. Consider the quantity $\frac{u}{\zeta}$ around $\tilde{x}$, where $\zeta = \varphi^{\tilde{x}}$ be the cutoff function in Lemma 2.5. Suppose the minimum of $\frac{u}{\zeta}$ is achieved at some point $\bar{x} \in \mathrm{supp}(\zeta)$. At the point $\bar{x}$, we have

$$\frac{\nabla u}{u} = \frac{\nabla\zeta}{\zeta}, \tag{2.16}$$

and

$$0 \leq \nabla^2 \log\frac{u}{\zeta} = \frac{\nabla^2 u}{u} - \frac{\nabla^2\zeta}{\zeta}. \tag{2.17}$$

Diagonalize $u_{ij} = \lambda_i\delta_{ij}$ at $\bar{x}$ with an orthonomal basis. It follows from (2.16) and (2.17) that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum\frac{\nabla_{ii}\zeta}{1+\lambda_i} &\leq \frac{\zeta}{u}(2 - \frac{2}{\sqrt{(1+\lambda_1)(1+\lambda_2)}}) \\ &= \frac{2\zeta}{u}(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{(-K_g)(|\nabla\zeta|^2\frac{u^2}{\zeta^2} + 2(\frac{u}{\zeta})\zeta)}}). \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

Denote

$$A = 2\sqrt{\max_{\bar{B}(\tilde{x},r_0)}(-K_g(x))}\coth(\sqrt{\max_{\bar{B}(\tilde{x},r_0)}(-K_g(x))}r_0).$$

Combining (2.18) and Lemma 2.5, we have

$$-2 \le \frac{2\zeta}{u}(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{(-K_g)(\frac{9}{C_1}\frac{u^2}{\zeta^2} + \frac{2r_0}{A}\frac{u}{\zeta})}}). \tag{2.19}$$

If $\sqrt{(-K_g)(\frac{9}{C_1}\frac{u^2}{\zeta^2} + \frac{2r_0}{A}\frac{u}{\zeta})} \le \frac{1}{2}$, by (2.19) we get

$$\frac{u}{\zeta} \ge 1. \tag{2.20}$$

On the other hand, if $\sqrt{(-K_g)(\frac{9}{C_1}\frac{u^2}{\zeta^2} + \frac{2r_0}{A}\frac{u}{\zeta})} > \frac{1}{2}$, direct computation shows

$$\frac{u}{\zeta} \ge \min\{\frac{A}{16r_0 \max\limits_{x\in\bar{B}(\tilde{x},r_0)}(-K_g(x))}, \frac{2C_1r_0}{9A}\}. \tag{2.21}$$

Combining (2.20) and (2.21), we have

$$\frac{u}{\zeta} \ge \min\{1, \frac{A}{16r_0 \max\limits_{x\in\bar{B}(\tilde{x},r_0)}(-K_g(x))}, \frac{2C_1r_0}{9A}\}.$$

In particular, this implies

$$u(\tilde{x}) \ge \min\{\frac{r_0}{2A}, \frac{1}{32 \max\limits_{x\in\bar{B}(\tilde{x},r_0)}(-K_g(x))}, \frac{C_1r_0^2}{9A^2}\}.$$

The proof of Proposition 2.6 is completed. □

Corollary 2.7 *For any $r_0 > 0$, there is a constant C depending only on r_0 and C_1 such that*

$$u(\tilde{x}) \ge \frac{C^{-1}}{\max\limits_{\bar{B}(\tilde{x},r_0)}(-K_g(x))}, \tag{2.22}$$

for any solution u to (2.9) defined on $\Omega \supset B(\tilde{x}, r_0)$.

3 Second and higher order estimates

In this section, we will give a purely local second order derivative estimate. This estimate could be done by Heinz-Lewy "characteristic" theory for Monge-Ampère equations in dimension two. The reader is referred to the lecture notes [19] by F. Schulz for detailed exposition. To state the result in [19], we consider the Monge-Ampère equation for a function $z = z(x, y)$ on a domain $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$:

$$(z_{xx} + C)(z_{yy} + A) - (z_{xy} - B)^2 = K(x, y, z)D(x, y, z, z_x, z_y) > 0. \tag{3.1}$$

where A, B, C, D are functions of x, y, z, p, q, and $p = z_x, q = z_y$.

Assumption i) $z \in C^{1,1}(\mathcal{D})$ and

$$|z_x| + |z_y| \leq \mathcal{K}_1. \tag{3.2}$$

Assumption ii) $A, B, C \in C^1(\mathcal{D} \times \mathbb{R}^3)$, $K \in C^\mu(\mathcal{D} \times \mathbb{R})$, for some $0 < \mu < 1$, $D \in C^1(\mathcal{D} \times \mathbf{R}^3)$ and

$$|A| + |B| + |C| + |D| \leq \mathcal{A}_1, \tag{3.3}$$

$$K, D \geq \frac{1}{\mathcal{A}_2}, \tag{3.4}$$

$$|\partial_{\mathcal{D}\times\mathbb{R}^3} A| + \cdots + |\partial_{\mathcal{D}\times\mathbb{R}^3} D| \leq \mathcal{A}_3, \tag{3.5}$$

$$|K|_{C^\mu(\mathcal{D}\times\mathbb{R})} \leq \mathcal{A}_4. \tag{3.6}$$

Assumption iii) The functions

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_1(x, y) &= A_p, \\ \phi_2(x, y) &= A_q + 2B_p, \\ \phi_3(x, y) &= C_p + 2B_q, \\ \phi_4(x, y) &= C_q \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

are Lipschitz continuous with

$$[\phi_1]^{\mathcal{D}}_{0,1} + \cdots + [\phi_4]^{\mathcal{D}}_{0,1} \leq \mathcal{A}_5. \tag{3.8}$$

Theorem 3.1 *(Theorem 9.4.1 in [19]) Suppose* $z \in C^{1,1}(\mathcal{D})$ *is a solution of (3.1) such that the above Assumptions i), ii), iii) hold with the constants* $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{A}_1, \cdots, \mathcal{A}_5$. *Then* $z \in C^{2,\mu}_{loc}(\mathcal{D})$, *and for any* $\mathcal{D}' \subset\subset \mathcal{D}$ *there is an interior estimate*

$$\|\partial^2 z\|_{C^\mu(\mathcal{D}')} \leq C(\mu, \mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{A}_1 \cdots \mathcal{A}_5, dist(\mathcal{D}', \partial\mathcal{D})). \tag{3.9}$$

For any $\tilde{x} \in M$, to invoke the result in [19], we fix a local coordinate system $(x, y) \in \mathcal{D}$ in M around $\tilde{x}$. Take $z(x, y)$ to be solution $u(x, y)$ of equation (2.9) defined on $\Omega \supset \mathcal{D}$. Then we find

$$\begin{aligned} A &= g_{22} - \Gamma^k_{22} p_k, \\ B &= -g_{12} + \Gamma^k_{12} p_k, \\ C &= g_{11} + \Gamma^k_{11} p_k, \\ D &= g^{kl} p_k p_l + 2z, \\ K(x, y, z) &= -K_g(x, y) det(g_{ij}), \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

where $p_1 = p, p_2 = q$.

Note that by Propositions 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, we have estimated the upper bound of u, ∇u and the lower bound of u in the coordinate system $\mathcal{D}$, this gives rise to a control of the constants $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{A}_1 \cdots \mathcal{A}_5$ in terms of the geometry of $(\mathcal{D}, g)$. From Theorem 3.1, we have immediately

Proposition 3.2 *For any nonnegative integer $k \geq 0$, there exists a constant $D_k > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{\Omega_l \supset B(x_0,k+1)} |u_l|_{C^{2,\mu}(\bar{B}(x_0,k+\frac{1}{2}))} \leq D_k, \tag{3.11}$$

where the norm $C^{2,\mu}(\bar{B}(x_0,k+\frac{1}{2}))$ can be defined on some (and any) fixed finite coordinate covering of $\bar{B}(x_0,k+\frac{1}{2})$.

We proceed to consider the third and higher order estimates (2.8). This may be done by standard Schauder estimate for elliptic equations.

Proposition 3.3 *For any nonnegative integer $k \geq 0$, there exists a constant $D_k > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{\Omega_l \supset B(x_0,k+1)} |u_l|_{C^{k}(\bar{B}(x_0,k))} \leq D_k, \tag{3.12}$$

where the norm $C^k(\bar{B}(x_0,k))$ can be defined on some (and any) fixed finite coordinate covering of $\bar{B}(x_0,k)$.

Proof. By (2.9), we see that $\nabla_i u$ satisfies an equation of the following type

$$\hat{g}^{jm} v_{jm} = f(x, v, \nabla v), \tag{3.13}$$

where $\hat{g} = \nabla^2 u + g$. By previous second order estimate, we know (3.13) is uniformly elliptic on $B(x_0, k+\frac{1}{2})$ and the C^μ norm of $\hat{g}$ and f are uniformly bounded (independent of l). The result follows from the standard interior Schauder estimate and bootstrap argument. □

Proof of Theorem 2.2. By Proposition 3.3 and Arzela-Ascoli theorem, we may extract a C^∞_{loc} convergent subsequence of u_l. The limit is the desired solution. □

Theorem 1.1 follows from Theorem 2.2 (see Remark 2.1).

4 Proof of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3

The proof of Theorem 1.2 is based on Proposition 2.3 and Theorem 3.1 and the following result.

Proposition 4.1 *Under the assumptions (1.3) (1.4) of Theorem 1.2, there exists $R > 0$, such that M admits a covering of isothermal coordinate charts $\{(U_i, (u^1, u^2))\}$ with $U_i = \{(u^1)^2 + (u^2)^2 < R^2\}$ such that*
1) for any $y_0 \in M$, there is an U_{i_0} with $y_0 \in \{(u^1)^2 + (u^2)^2 < \frac{R^2}{4}\} \subset U_{i_0}$,
2) in each U_i, the metric g of M takes the form

$$g = \psi[(du^1)^2 + (du^2)^2],$$

and it satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} c^{-1} \leq \psi \leq c, \\ |\psi|_{C^{2,\mu}(U_i)} \leq c_\mu, \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

where c and c_μ are constants independent of i. Moreover, if the additional (1.6) is satisfied, we have

$$|\psi|_{C^{l+1,\alpha}(U_i)} \leq c_{l,\alpha} \qquad \text{for any } \alpha \in (0,1), \tag{4.2}$$

where $c_{l,\alpha}$ are constants independent of i.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. By Proposition 2.3 and Theorem 1.1, we know there exists a smooth isometric embedding $X : M \to \mathbb{R}^{2,1}$ such that $u = -\frac{1}{2}\langle X, X\rangle$ satisfying $\frac{1}{2C_2} \leq u \leq \frac{1}{2C_1}$. Let R be the constant provided in Proposition 4.1. Let the coordinates (x, y) in equation (3.1) to be the isothermal coordinates (u^1, u^2) in Proposition 4.1, $z(x, y) = u(x, y)$, and $\mathcal{D} = \{x^2 + y^2 < \frac{R^2}{4}\}$. In these coordinates, (3.10) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \psi - \Gamma^k_{22} p_k, \\ B &= \Gamma^k_{12} p_k, \\ C &= \psi + \Gamma^k_{11} p_k, \\ D &= \psi^{-1}(p_1^2 + p_2^2) + 2z, \\ K(x, y, z) &= -K_g(x, y)\psi^2. \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

Estimate (4.1) and the Proposition 2.4 imply that there is a constant C depending only on C_1, C_2, C_μ such that the constants in (3.2)-(3.8) can be bounded by C

$$\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{A}_1, \cdots, \mathcal{A}_5 \leq C.$$

Theorem 3.1 implies $|\partial_{ij} u|_{C^\mu(B(0, \frac{R}{4}))} \leq C$. Combining this with (4.1) particularly gives $|h_{ij}| \leq C$. This proves ii) in Theorem 1.2. □

If the additional higher covariant derivatives bound (1.6) is assumed, notice that (4.2) holds, then (1.7) follows by the same argument in Proposition 3.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. After an isometry $\tilde{\imath}$ of $\mathbb{R}^{2,1}$, $\tilde{\imath} \circ \tilde{X}(M)$ can be pinched between the light cone and a hyperboloid associated to X, and we can define $\tilde{u} = -\frac{1}{2}\langle \tilde{\imath} \circ \tilde{X}, \tilde{\imath} \circ \tilde{X}\rangle$, which satisfies $0 < \tilde{u} \leq C$.

Using the polar coordinates in Remark 2.1, we know that $\tilde{\imath} \circ \tilde{X}$ is determined by $\tilde{u}$ and an isometry $\tilde{i} : (M, \frac{g + (d\sqrt{2\tilde{u}})^2}{2\tilde{u}}) \to \mathbb{H}$. To show that $\tilde{\imath} \circ \tilde{X}$ is congruent to X, it suffices to show that $u = \tilde{u}$. Indeed, once we have $u = \tilde{u}$, then $\tilde{\imath} \circ \tilde{X} = \sigma \circ X$, where $\sigma = \tilde{i} i^{-1} \in Iso(\mathbb{H}) \subset Iso(\mathbb{R}^{2,1})$. Then $\tilde{X} = \iota \circ X$, where $\iota = \tilde{\imath}^{-1} \circ \sigma$.

We need some a prior estimates of $\tilde{u}$ up to second order. The powerful tool is the Cheng-Yau's maximum principle [1], since the curvature is assumed to be bounded: for any C^2 function F bounded from above, there is a sequence of $x_k \in M$ and $\varepsilon_k \to 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &a)\ \sup_M F - F(x_k) \leq \varepsilon_k, \\ &b)\ |\nabla F|(x_k) \leq \varepsilon_k, \\ &c)\ \nabla^2 F(x_k) \leq \varepsilon_k g. \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Applying the above maximum principle to $\tilde{u}$ and $-\tilde{u}$, we immediately know

$$\frac{1}{2C_2} \leq \tilde{u} \leq \frac{1}{2C_1}.$$

We claim that the gradient of $\tilde{u}$ is also bounded, and more precisely, it satisfies

$$|\nabla \tilde{u}| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{C_1}}.$$

Indeed, for any $\tilde{x} \in M$, let γ be a geodesic of unit speed such that $\gamma(0) = \tilde{x}$. we would like to control $|\frac{d}{dt}(\tilde{u} \circ \gamma)(0)|$. By the convexity of the function $\tilde{u} + \frac{1}{2}d^2(\tilde{x}, \cdot)$, we know

$$t|\frac{d}{dt}(\tilde{u} \circ \gamma)(0)| \leq \max\{\tilde{u}(\gamma(t)) - \tilde{u}(\gamma(0)), \tilde{u}(\gamma(-t)) - \tilde{u}(\gamma(0))\} + \frac{t^2}{2}$$

It follows that $|\frac{d}{dt}(\tilde{u} \circ \gamma)(0)| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{C_1}}$ by taking $t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{C_1}}$. This implies $|\nabla \tilde{u}|(\tilde{x}) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{C_1}}$, and the claim is proved.

Combining the gradient estimate of $\tilde{u}$ with the proof of Proposition 3.2, we know that $|\nabla^2 \tilde{u}|$ is bounded.

Summarizing the above estimates, it follows that there is $C > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{C} \leq u_t \leq C, \quad |\nabla u_t| \leq C, \ \nabla^2 u_t + g \geq C^{-1} g, \tag{4.5}$$

where $u_t = u + t(\tilde{u} - u)$, $t \in [0, 1]$.

Note that u and $\tilde{u}$ satisfy the same equation (2.4), this implies

$$\int_0^1 (g + \nabla^2 u_t)^{ij} dt \nabla^2_{ij}(\tilde{u} - u) = \int_0^1 \frac{2\langle \nabla u_t, \nabla(\tilde{u} - u)\rangle + 2(\tilde{u} - u)}{|\nabla u_t|^2 + 2u_t} dt \tag{4.6}$$

Let $F = \tilde{u} - u$ in (4.4), combining (4.4) with (4.5) (4.6), we have

$$C\varepsilon_k \geq \sup_M (\tilde{u} - u).$$

This gives $u \geq \tilde{u}$. Similarly, we have $u \leq \tilde{u}$. Hence $u = \tilde{u}$.

To prove ii), one can show $u \circ \gamma = u$ for any $\gamma \in Iso(M, g)$ by the above Cheng-Yau's maximum principle (4.4). This implies $Iso(M, g) \subset Iso(M, \bar{g})$, where $\bar{g} = \frac{g + (d\sqrt{2u})^2}{2u}$. The injective homomorphism $\rho : Iso(M, g) \to Iso(\mathbb{H})$ is given by $\rho(\gamma) = i \circ \gamma \circ i^{-1}$. □

5 Appendix

The purpose of this appendix is to give an alternative method for second order estimate. The argument we present here is classical, straightforward, and may be generalized to higher dimensions (see [6]). The price to be paid is that this method requires some geometry of the background manifold. It works well on those points where the values of u (solution of (2.9)) are not too large, comparing to the local geometry.

Proposition 5.1 *There exists $C > 0$ depending only on C_1 satisfying the following property. Fix $\tilde{x} \in M$, suppose there exist a real number $r_0 > 0$ and a solution u of (2.9) defined on domain $\Omega_l \supset B(\tilde{x}, r_0)$ satisfying*

$$u(\tilde{x}) < \frac{r_0}{2\sqrt{\max\limits_{y \in \bar{B}(\tilde{x}, r_0)}(-K_g(y))} \coth(\sqrt{\max\limits_{y \in \bar{B}(\tilde{x}, r_0)}(-K_g(y))} r_0)}. \tag{5.1}$$

Then

$$(g + \nabla^2 u)(x) \leq \frac{e^{Cc_2'}}{\frac{r_0}{2\sqrt{c_2}\coth(\sqrt{c_2} r_0)} - u(\tilde{x})} (1 + \sqrt{c_4}\frac{r_0}{\sqrt{c_2}} + c_2'(1 + \frac{r_0}{\sqrt{c_2}} + c_3\frac{r_0}{\sqrt{c_2}})), \tag{5.2}$$

on $B(\tilde{x}, \frac{\sqrt{C_1}(\frac{r_0}{2\sqrt{c_2}\coth(\sqrt{c_2}r_0)}-u(\tilde{x}))}{6})$, *where*

$$\begin{aligned} c_2 &= \max_{x\in\bar{B}(\tilde{x},r_0)}(-K_g(x)), & c_2' &= \max_{x\in\bar{B}(\tilde{x},r_0+1)}(-K_g(x)), \\ c_3 &= \max_{x\in\bar{B}(\tilde{x},r_0)}|\nabla\log(-K_g(x))|, & c_4 &= \max_{x\in\bar{B}(\tilde{x},r_0)}|\nabla^2\log(-K_g(x))|. \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

Note that by Proposition 2.3, condition (5.1) can be justified at each $\tilde{x}$ (for suitable r_0) when the curvature K satisfies

$$-C_2^2(d(x,x_0)+C_3)^2 \le K(x) \le -C_1 \tag{5.4}$$

for some $x_0 \in M$ and positive constants $0 < C_2 < C_1 < C_3$.
Proof of Proposition 5.1. Consider an auxiliary function:

$$\begin{cases} STM \to \mathbb{R} \\ (x,\gamma) \to \eta(x)(1+\nabla_{\gamma\gamma}u)e^{\frac{a}{2}(|\nabla u|^2+2u)(x)}, \end{cases} \tag{5.5}$$

where $x \in M, \gamma \in T_xM, |\gamma| = 1$, STM is the unit tangent bundle of M, η is a cutoff function on M and $a \ge 1$ is a constant to be specified later. Suppose the maximum

$$\max_{(x,\gamma)\in STM}\eta(1+\nabla_{\gamma\gamma}u)e^{\frac{a}{2}(|\nabla u|^2+2u)}$$

is achieved at $\bar{x} \in \mathrm{supp}(\eta)$ for some $\gamma \in T_{\bar{x}}M$ with $|\gamma| = 1$. Diagonalize $u_{ij} = \lambda_i\delta_{ij}$ at $\bar{x}$ with the orthonormal eigenvectors e_i. Let $e_1 = \gamma$. Parallel transport each e_i along radial geodesics, we obtain a field of orthonormal frame $\{e_i\}$ near $\bar{x}$. The function $w = \eta(1+\nabla_{e_1,e_1}u)e^{\frac{a}{2}(|\nabla u|^2+2u)}$ defined near $\bar{x}$ achieves its maximum at $\bar{x}$. In the following, we use C to denote various big constants depending only on C_1.

At the point $\bar{x}$, we have

$$0 = \nabla_i \log w = \frac{\nabla_{i11}u}{1+\lambda_1} + a(1+\lambda_i)u_i + \frac{\nabla_i\eta}{\eta}, \tag{5.6}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \ge \nabla_{ij}\log w =& \frac{\nabla_{ij11}u}{1+\lambda_1} - \frac{\nabla_{i11}u\nabla_{j11}u}{(1+\lambda_1)^2} + a(u_k\nabla_{ijk}u + (\lambda_i+\lambda_i^2)\delta_{ij}) \\ &+ \frac{\nabla_{ij}\eta}{\eta} - \frac{\nabla_i\eta\nabla_j\eta}{\eta^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

Let $f = f(x,z,p) \triangleq \log(-K) + \log(|\nabla u|^2 + 2u))$, where $z = u, p = \nabla u$. Differentiating the equation (2.9), we get

$$\frac{\nabla_{kii}u}{1+\lambda_i} = \nabla_k f, \tag{5.8}$$

$$\frac{\nabla_{11ii}u}{1+\lambda_i} - \frac{(\nabla_{1ij}u)^2}{(1+\lambda_i)(1+\lambda_j)} = f_{11}. \tag{5.9}$$

Combining (5.7), (5.8), (5.9) and Ricci formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&(1+\lambda_1)\Big(-\frac{\nabla_{ii}\eta}{(1+\lambda_i)\eta}+\frac{|\nabla_i\eta|^2}{(1+\lambda_i)\eta^2}\Big)\\&+\frac{1}{1+\lambda_i}\Big[\frac{(\nabla_{i11}u)^2}{1+\lambda_1}-a(R_{ijip}u_pu_j+\lambda_i+\lambda_i^2)(1+\lambda_1)\\&-(\nabla_iR_{i11p}+\nabla_1R_{i1ip})u_p-2R_{1i1i}(\lambda_1-\lambda_i)\Big]-\frac{(\nabla_{1ij}u)^2}{(1+\lambda_i)(1+\lambda_j)}\\&\geq f_{11}+au_j\nabla_jf(1+\lambda_1).\end{aligned}\tag{5.10}$$

By direct computations, we have (at $\bar{x}$)

$$\begin{aligned}f_{11}+au_k\nabla_kf(1+\lambda_1)\geq&\frac{2}{|\nabla u|^2+2u}\langle\nabla u,-a\nabla u-\frac{\nabla\eta}{\eta}\rangle(1+\lambda_1)\\&+\log(-K)_{11}+a\langle\nabla\log(-K),\nabla u\rangle(1+\lambda_1)\\&+\frac{a(1+\lambda_1)|\nabla u|^2}{|\nabla u|^2+2u}-\frac{8(|\lambda_1|+1)^2}{|\nabla u|^2+2u}+2\frac{R_{1j1l}u_ju_l}{|\nabla u|^2+2u}.\end{aligned}\tag{5.11}$$

By (5.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_i\frac{|\nabla_i\eta|^2}{(1+\lambda_i)\eta^2}(1+\lambda_1)=&\frac{|\nabla_1\eta|^2}{\eta^2}+\sum_{i\geq2}\frac{|\nabla_{i11}u|^2}{(1+\lambda_1)(1+\lambda_i)}\\&-2a(1+\lambda_1)\nabla_iu\frac{\nabla_i\eta}{\eta}-a^2(1+\lambda_1)(1+\lambda_i)u_i^2.\end{aligned}\tag{5.12}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{i,j}\frac{(\nabla_{1ij}u)^2}{(1+\lambda_i)(1+\lambda_j)}-\sum_i\frac{(\nabla_{i11}u)^2}{(1+\lambda_1)(1+\lambda_i)}-\sum_{i\geq2}\frac{|\nabla_{i11}u|^2}{(1+\lambda_1)(1+\lambda_i)}\\\geq&-4\frac{|\nabla u|}{|\nabla u|^2+2u}\frac{|\nabla\eta|}{\eta}(1+\lambda_1),\end{aligned}\tag{5.13}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_i-\frac{1}{1+\lambda_i}(R_{ijip}u_pu_j+\lambda_i+\lambda_i^2)(1+\lambda_1)\\\leq&-\frac{2u}{|\nabla u|^2+2u}(1+\lambda_1)^2+2(1+\lambda_1),\end{aligned}\tag{5.14}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{1+\lambda_i}[-(\nabla_iR_{i11p}+\nabla_1R_{i1ip})u_p-2R_{1i1i}(\lambda_1-\lambda_i)]\\\leq&\frac{2|\nabla u|}{|\nabla u|^2+2u}|\nabla\log(-K)|(1+\lambda_1)+\frac{2}{|\nabla u|^2+2u}(1+\lambda_1)^2+2K.\end{aligned}\tag{5.15}$$

Multiplying both sides of (5.10) by η^2, combining (5.11)-(5.15), we get

$$L_1(1+\lambda_1)^2\eta^2-L_2(1+\lambda_1)\eta-L_3\leq\eta(1+\lambda_1)\sum_{i\geq1}\frac{-\nabla_{ii}\eta}{1+\lambda_i},\tag{5.16}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
L_1 &= a\frac{2u}{|\nabla u|^2+2u} - \frac{10}{|\nabla u|^2+2u},\\
L_2 &= (6\frac{|\nabla u|}{|\nabla u|^2+2u} + 2a|\nabla u|)|\nabla\eta| + 2a\eta + \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{|\nabla u|^2+2u}a\eta\\
&\quad + a|\nabla\log(-K)||\nabla u|\eta + \frac{2|\nabla u|}{|\nabla u|^2+2u}|\nabla\log(-K)|\eta,\\
L_3 &= |\nabla\eta|^2 + \eta^2|\nabla^2\log(-K)| + 2K\frac{|\nabla_1 u|^2+2u}{|\nabla u|^2+2u}\eta^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

Note that by (5.1), Lemma 2.5 is applicable. Choose the cutoff function η in (5.5) to be $\varphi^{\tilde{x}}$ in Lemma 2.5, and consider the maximum of the quantity w on $Q_{\tilde{x}}$. From iii) in Lemma 2.5, we have

$$\eta(1+\lambda_1)\sum_{i\geq 1}\frac{-\nabla_{ii}\eta}{1+\lambda_i} \leq 2(1+\lambda_1)\eta. \tag{5.18}$$

Since $u(\bar{x}) \geq C^{-1}{c_2'}^{-1}$ by Corollary 2.7, choosing $a = Cc_2'$ in (5.17) and combining Lemma 2.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
L_1 &\geq \frac{10}{|\nabla u|^2+2u} \geq 2C_1,\\
L_2 &\leq c_2'(1+\frac{r_0}{\sqrt{c_2}} + c_3\frac{r_0}{\sqrt{c_2}}),\\
L_3 &\leq C(1+c_4)\frac{r_0^2}{c_2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.19}$$

From (5.16), (5.19), (5.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(1+\lambda_1)\eta &\leq \max\{\sqrt{\frac{2L_3}{L_1}}, \frac{2(L_2+2)}{L_1}\}\\
&\leq C(1+\sqrt{c_4}\frac{r_0}{\sqrt{c_2}} + c_2'(1+\frac{r_0}{\sqrt{c_2}} + c_3\frac{r_0}{\sqrt{c_2}})).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.20}$$

Combining Lemma 2.5 i) and (5.20), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(1+\lambda_1)(x) \leq &\frac{e^{Cc_2'}}{\frac{r_0}{2\sqrt{c_2}\coth(\sqrt{c_2}r_0)} - u(\tilde{x})}\\
&\times (1+\sqrt{c_4}\frac{r_0}{\sqrt{c_2}} + c_2'(1+\frac{r_0}{\sqrt{c_2}} + c_3\frac{r_0}{\sqrt{c_2}}))
\end{aligned} \tag{5.21}$$

on $B(\tilde{x}, \frac{\sqrt{C_1}(\frac{r_0}{2\sqrt{c_2}\coth(\sqrt{c_2}r_0)} - u(\tilde{x}))}{6})$.

The proof of Proposition 5.1 is completed. □

Remark 5.1 *The most computations in this section are just modifications of those in the classical theory of Monge-Ampère equations. A closer reference is [6], where the Dirichlet problem of real Monge-Ampère equations on manifolds has been systematically studied. The observation is that these estimates could be localized under certain geometric conditions.*

References

[1] S. Y. Cheng and S. T. Yau, *On the existence of complete Kähler metric on non-compact complex manifolds and regularity of Fefferman's equation,* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **33** (1980), 507-544.

[2] N. V. Efimov, *Generation of singularites on surfaces of negative curvature,* Mat. Sb. **64** (1964), 286-320.

[3] B. Guan, *The Dirichlet problem for Monge-Ampère equations in non-convex domains and spacelike hypersurfaces of constant Gauss curvature*, Tran. Amer. Math. Soc. **350** (1998), 4955-4971.

[4] B. Guan, *Isometric embedding of negatively curved disks in the Minkowski space*, Pure Appl. Math. Quar. **3** (2007), 827-840.

[5] B. Guan, H. Y. Jian and R. Schoen, *Entire spacelike hypersurfaces of prescribed Gauss curvature in Minkowski space,* J. Reine Angew. Math. **595** (2006), 167-188.

[6] B. Guan and Y. Y. Li, *Monge-Ampère equations on Riemannian manifolds,* J. Diff. Equa. **132** (1996), 126-139.

[7] P. F. Guan and Y. Y. Li, *The Weyl problem with nonnegative Gauss curvature,* J. Diff. Geom. **39** (1994), 331-342.

[8] D. Hilbert, *Uber Plächen von constanter Gausscher Krümmung,* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **2** (1901), 87-99.

[9] Q. Han, *On the isometric embedding of surfaces with Gauss curvature changing sign cleanly,* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **58** (2005), 285-295.

[10] Q. Han, *Local isometric embedding of surfaces with Gauss curvature changing sign stably across a curve*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **25** (2006), 79-103.

[11] Q. Han and J. X. Hong, *Isometric embedding of Riemannian manifolds in Euclidean spaces*, Mathematical surveys and Monographs 130, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 2006.

[12] Q. Han, J. X. Hong and C. S. Lin, *Local isometric embedding of surfaces with nonpositive Gaussian curvature*, J. Diff. Geom. **63** (2003), 475-520.

[13] J. X. Hong, *Recent developments of realization of surfaces in* $\mathbb{R}^3$, First International Congress of Chinese Mathematicians (Beijing, 1998), 47-62, AMS/IP Stud. Adv. Math. 20, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 2001.

[14] J. X. Hong and C. Zuilly, *Isometric embedding of the 2-sphere with nonnegative curvature in* $\mathbb{R}^3$, Math. Z. **219** (1995), 323-334.

[15] C. S. Lin, *The local isometric embedding in* $\mathbb{R}^3$ *of 2-dimensional Riemannian manifolds with nonnegative curvature*, J. Diff. Geom. **21** (1985), 213-230.

[16] C. S. Lin, *The local isometric embedding in $\mathbb{R}^3$ of two-dimensional Riemannian manifolds with Gaussian curvature changing sign cleanly*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **39** (1986), 867-887.

[17] L. Nirenberg, *The Weyl and Minkowski problems in differential geometry in the large*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **6** (1953), 337-394.

[18] A. V. Pogorelov, *Regularity of a convex surface with given Gaussian curvature*, Mat. Sb. **31** (1952), 88-103.

[19] F. Schulz, *Regularity theory for quasilinear elliptic systems and Monge-Ampère equations in two dimensions*, Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 1445, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990.

[20] H. Weyl, *über die Bestimmung einer geschlossen konvexen Fläche durch ihr Linienelement*, Vierteljahrsschrift Naturforsch. Gesellschaft **61** (1916), 40-72.

[21] S. T. Yau, *Riview of geometry and analysis*, Asian J. Math. **4** (2000), 235-278.

Bing-Long Chen
Department of Mathematics,
Sun Yat-Sen University,
Guangzhou, P.R.China, 510275
Email: mcscbl@mail.sysu.edu.cn

Le Yin
College of Mathematics and Computational Science,
Shenzhen University,
Shenzhen, P.R.China, 518060
Email: lyin@szu.edu.cn